HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BROOKS SPORTS, INC., a Washington corporation,
 	
       Plaintiff,
 	
v.
 	
SPARC Group, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, AUTHENTIC BRANDS GROUP, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, BB IPCO, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, BB OPCO LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,
 	
       Defendants.
	CASE NO. 2:20-cv-1491 RSM
	
	AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND ORDER

The parties hereby stipulate to the following provisions regarding the discovery of electronically stored information ("ESI") in this matter:

A. General Principles

1. An attorney's zealous representation of a client is not compromised by conducting discovery in a cooperative manner. The failure of counsel or the parties to litigation to cooperate in facilitating and reasonably limiting discovery requests and responses raises litigation costs and contributes to the risk of sanctions.

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 1

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

2.   As provided in LCR 26(f), the proportionality standard set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) must be applied in each case when formulating a discovery plan. To further the application of the proportionality standard in discovery, requests for production of ESI and related responses should be reasonably targeted, clear, and as specific as possible.

B.   **ESI Disclosures**

Within 30 days of entry of this Order, or at a later time if agreed to by the parties, each party shall disclose:

1.   Custodians. The five custodians most likely to have discoverable ESI in their possession, custody, or control. The custodians shall be identified by name, title, connection to the instant litigation, and the type of the information under the custodian's control.

2.   Non-custodial Data Sources. A list of non-custodial data sources (*e.g.*, shared drives, servers), if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI.

3.   Third-Party Data Sources. A list of third-party data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI (*e.g.*, third-party email providers, mobile device providers, cloud storage) and, for each such source, the extent to which a party is (or is not) able to preserve information stored in the third-party data source.

4.   Inaccessible Data. A list of data sources, if any, likely to contain discoverable ESI (by type, date, custodian, electronic system or other criteria sufficient to specifically identify the data source) that a party asserts is not reasonably accessible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B). [

C.   **ESI Discovery Procedures**

1.   On-site inspection of electronic media. Such an inspection shall not be required absent a demonstration by the requesting party of specific need and good cause or by agreement of the parties.

2.   Search methodology. The parties shall timely confer to attempt to reach agreement on appropriate search terms and queries, file type and date restrictions, data sources (including custodians), and other appropriate computer- or technology-aided methodologies, before any such

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 2

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

1 effort is undertaken. The parties shall continue to cooperate in revising the appropriateness of the

2 search methodology.

3   a.   Prior to running searches:

4   i.   The producing party shall disclose the data sources (including

5 custodians), search terms and queries, any file type and date restrictions, and any other

6 methodology that it proposes to use to locate ESI likely to contain responsive and discoverable

7 information. The producing party may provide unique hit counts for each search query.

8   ii.   The requesting party is entitled to, within 14 days of the producing

9 party's disclosure, add no more than 10 search terms or queries to those disclosed by the producing

10 party absent a showing of good cause or agreement of the parties.

11   iii.   The following provisions apply to search terms / queries of the

12 requesting party. Focused terms and queries should be employed; broad terms or queries, such as

13 product and company names, generally should be avoided. A conjunctive combination of multiple

14 words or phrases (*e.g.*, "computer" and "system") narrows the search and shall count as a single

15 search term. A disjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (*e.g.*, "computer" or "system")

16 broadens the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search term unless they

17 are variants of the same word. The producing party may identify each search term or query

18 returning overbroad results demonstrating the overbroad results and a counter proposal correcting

19 the overbroad search or query.

20   b.   After production: Within 21 days of the producing party notifying the

21 receiving party that it has substantially completed the production of documents responsive to a

22 request, the responding party may request no more than 10 additional search terms or queries. The

23 immediately preceding section (Section C(2)(a)(iii)) applies.

24   3.   Format.

25   a.   ESI will be produced to the requesting party with searchable text, in a format

26 to be decided between the parties. Acceptable formats include, but are not limited to, native files,

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 3

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

multi-page TIFFs (with a companion OCR or extracted text file), single-page TIFFs (only with load files for e-discovery software that includes metadata fields identifying natural document breaks and also includes companion OCR and/or extracted text files), and searchable PDF.

b.   Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, files that are not easily converted to image format, such as spreadsheet, database, and drawing files, will be produced in native format with corresponding image placeholder

c.   Each document image file shall be named with a unique number (Bates Number). File names should not be more than twenty characters long or contain spaces. When a text-searchable image file is produced, the producing party must preserve the integrity of the underlying ESI, *i.e.*, the original formatting, the metadata (as noted below) and, where applicable, the revision history.

d.   If a document is more than one page, the unitization of the document and any attachments and/or affixed notes shall be maintained as they existed in the original document.

e.   The parties shall produce their information in the following format: single-page images and associated multi-page text files containing extracted text or with appropriate software load files containing all information required by the litigation support system used by the receiving party.

f.   The full text of each electronic document shall be extracted ("Extracted Text") and produced in a text file. The Extracted Text shall be provided in searchable ASCII text format (or Unicode text format if the text is in a foreign language) and shall be named with a unique Bates Number (*e.g.*, the unique Bates Number of the first page of the corresponding production version of the document followed by its file extension).

4.   <u>De-duplication.</u> The parties may de-duplicate their ESI production across custodial and non-custodial data sources after disclosure to the requesting party, and the duplicate custodian information removed during the de-duplication process tracked in a duplicate/other custodian field in the database load file.

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 4

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

5.   Email Threading. The parties may use analytics technology to identify email threads and need only produce the unique most inclusive copy and related family members and may exclude lesser inclusive copies. Upon reasonable request, the producing party will produce a less inclusive copy.

6.   Metadata fields. If the requesting party seeks metadata, the parties agree that only the following metadata fields need be produced, and only to the extent it is reasonably accessible and non-privileged: BegBates; End Bates; BegAttach; EndAttach; confidentiality designation; document type; custodian and duplicate custodians (or storage location if no custodian); author/from; recipient/to, cc and bcc; title/subject; email subject; file name; file size; file extension; original file path; date and time created, sent, modified and/or received; and hash value. The list of metadata type is intended to be flexible and may be changed by agreement of the parties, particularly in light of advances and changes in technology, vendor, and business practices.

7.   Hard-Copy Documents. If the parties elect to produce hard-copy documents in an electronic format, the production of hard-copy documents will include a cross-reference file that indicates document breaks and sets forth the custodian or custodian/location associated with each produced document. Hard-copy documents will be scanned using Optical Character Recognition technology and searchable ASCII text files will be produced (or Unicode text format if the text is in a foreign language), unless the producing party can show that the cost would outweigh the usefulness of scanning (for example, when the condition of the paper is not conducive to scanning and will not result in accurate or reasonably useable/searchable ESI). Each file will be named with a unique Bates Number (*e.g.*, the unique Bates Number of the first page of the corresponding production version of the document followed by its file extension).

D.   Preservation of ESI

The parties acknowledge that they have a common law obligation, as expressed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(e), to take reasonable and proportional steps to preserve discoverable information in the

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 5

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

party's possession, custody, or control. With respect to preservation of ESI, the parties agree as follows:

1.   Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the parties shall not be required to modify the procedures used by them in the ordinary course of business to back-up and archive data; provided, however, that the parties shall preserve all discoverable ESI in their possession, custody, or control.

2.   The parties will supplement their disclosures in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e) with discoverable ESI responsive to a particular discovery request or mandatory disclosure where that data is created after a disclosure or response is made (unless excluded under Sections (D)(3) or (E)(1)-(2)).

3.   Absent a showing of good cause by the requesting party, the following categories of ESI need not be preserved:

        a.   Deleted, slack, fragmented, or other data only accessible by forensics.

        b.   Random access memory (RAM), temporary files, or other ephemeral data that are difficult to preserve without disabling the operating system.

        c.   On-line access data such as temporary internet files, history, cache, cookies, and the like.

        d.   Data in metadata fields that are frequently updated automatically, such as last-opened dates (see also Section (E)(5)).

        e.   Back-up data that are duplicative of data that are more accessible elsewhere.

        f.   Server, system or network logs.

        g.   Data remaining from systems no longer in use that is unintelligible on the systems in use.

        h.   Electronic data (*e.g.*, email, calendars, contact data, and notes) sent to or from mobile devices (*e.g.*, iPhone, iPad, Android devices), provided that a

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 6

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

1   copy of all such electronic data is automatically saved in real time

2   elsewhere (such as on a server, laptop, desktop computer, or "cloud"

3   storage).

4   **E.   Privilege**

5   1.   A producing party shall create a privilege log of all documents fully withheld from

6   production on the basis of a privilege or protection, unless otherwise agreed or excepted by this

7   Agreement and Order. Privilege logs shall include a unique identification number for each

8   document and the basis for the claim (attorney-client privileged or work-product protection). For

9   ESI, the privilege log may be generated using available metadata, including author/recipient or

10   to/from/cc/bcc names; the subject matter or title; and date created. Should the available metadata

11   provide insufficient information for the purpose of evaluating the privilege claim asserted, the

12   producing party shall include such additional information as required by the Federal Rules of Civil

13   Procedure.

14   2.   Redactions need not be logged so long as the basis for the redaction is clear on the

15   redacted document.

16   3.   With respect to privileged or work-product information generated after the filing of

17   the complaint, parties are not required to include any such information in privilege logs.

18   4.   Activities undertaken in compliance with the duty to preserve information are

19   protected from disclosure and discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3)(A) and (B).

20   5.   Pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 502(d), the production of any documents in this

21   proceeding shall not, for the purposes of this proceeding or any other federal or state proceeding,

22   constitute a waiver by the producing party of any privilege applicable to those documents, including

23   the attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product protection, or any other privilege or protection

24   recognized by law. Information produced in discovery that is protected as privileged or work

25   product shall be immediately returned to the producing party, and its production shall not constitute

26   a waiver of such protection.

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 7

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM

SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
Telephone: (206) 676-7000
Fax: (206) 676-7001

1   DATED this 2nd day of August, 2021.

2   SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC   LANE POWELL PC

3

4   By *s/ Diana Siri Breaux*   By *s/Tiffany Connors (with consent)*
         Diana Siri Breaux, WSBA #46112   Tiffany Connors, WSBA No. 41740
5   Hathaway Burden, WSBA #52970   Joseph Adamson, WSBA No. 54752
         315 Fifth Avenue S., Suite 1000   1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4200
6   Seattle, WA 98104   Seattle, WA 98111
         dianab@summitlaw.com   connorst@lanepowell.com
7   hathawayb@summitlaw.com   adamsonj@lanepowell.com

8   *Attorneys for Plaintiff*   *Attorneys for Defendant*

9

10

11   PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB &   HODGSON RUSS LLP
     TYLER, LLP

12   By *s/Aron Fischer (with consent)*   By *Robert J. Fluskey (with consent)*
         Geoffrey Potter (*admitted pro hac vice*)   Robert J. Fluskey (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
13   Aron Fischer (*admitted pro hac vice*)   140 Pearl Street, Suite 100
         Lachlan Campbell-Verduyn (*admitted pro*   Buffalo, NY 14202
14   *hac vice*)   rfluskey@hodgsonruss.com
         1133 Avenue of the Americas
15   New York, NY 10036   And
         gpotter@pbwt.com
16   *afischer@pbwt.com*   Neil B. Friedman (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
         lcampbellverduyn@pbwt.com   25 Main Street, Suite 605
17   Hackensack, NJ 07601
                                                      nfriedman@hodgsonruss.com
18

19   *Attorneys for Plaintiff*   *Attorneys for Defendant*

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF   SUMMIT LAW GROUP, PLLC
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND   315 FIFTH AVENUE SOUTH, SUITE 1000
ORDER - 8   SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-2682
                                                        Telephone: (206) 676-7000
CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM   Fax: (206) 676-7001

1

ORDER

2
Based on the foregoing, IT IS SO ORDERED.

3
DATED this 2nd day of August, 2021.

4

5

6

7
RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

AGREEMENT REGARDING DISCOVERY OF
ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION AND
ORDER - 9

CASE NO. 2:20-CV-1491 RSM